

**REMARKS**

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed November 13, 2008. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 3-15 as set forth herein.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1, 4-7, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Suzuki, U.S. Publ. Appl. No. 2003/0123603 A1 (hereinafter "Suzuki").

Claims 3 and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Banks et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,603,494 (hereinafter "Banks").

Claim 9 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for alleged indefiniteness.

Claim 15 is indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

**Claim amendments**

**Claim 15**, which is indicated as containing allowable subject matter, is placed into independent form including all limitations of canceled base **claim 1**.

Each of **claims 4, 5, 7, 10, and 14** are placed off of claim 15.

**Claim 6** is amended to incorporate subject matter of allowable claim 15.

**Claim 9** is amended to incorporate subject matter of allowable claim 15, and to remove recitation alleged to be indefinite.

**The claims present patentable subject matter  
and should be allowed**

**Claim 15**, which is indicated as containing allowable subject matter, is placed into independent form including all limitations of canceled base **claim 1**. Dependent **claims 4, 5, 7, 10, and 14** are placed off of claim 15. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4, 5, 7, 10, 14, and 15 are in condition for allowance. Applicants urge allowance of these claims.

**Claim 6** is amended to incorporate subject matter of allowable claim 15. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 11-13 are in condition for allowance. Applicants urge allowance of these claims.

**Claim 9** is amended to incorporate subject matter of allowable claim 15, and to remove recitation including the phrase "share the same geometry" which the Office Action alleges to be indefinite. It is respectfully requested that the § 112, second paragraph rejection be withdrawn in view of this latter amendment.

Applicants continue to respectfully submit that claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the proposed combination of Suzuki and Banks. The helical computed tomography (CT) of Suzuki is not amenable to conduct several different magnetic resonance imaging sequences at individual imaging stations, the control system grouping all image acquisition sequences to be performed at each individual station together and performing all image acquisition sequences to be performed at each individual station together before the patient support is moved to a next station of the various imaging stations. Helical CT entails moving the patient (via the moving patient support) during the imaging, thus precluding performing all image acquisition sequences to be performed at each individual station together *before the patient support is moved* to a next station of the various imaging stations.

Additionally, claim 9 is respectfully submitted to be allowable on the further basis of subject matter incorporated from allowable claim 15.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9, 3, and 8 are in condition for allowance. Applicants urge allowance of these claims.

**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-15 present patentable subject matter and meet all statutory requirements. Accordingly, Applicants earnestly request allowance of claims 3-15.

In the event that personal contact is deemed advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at (216) 363-9000.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP



Thomas E. Kocovsky, Jr.  
Reg. No. 28,383  
Robert M. Sieg  
Reg. No. 54,446  
The Halle Building, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1228 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44115  
(216) 363-9000